

Remarks/Arguments

Applicants have amended claim 1. Claims 1 – 5 remain pending in this application, and Applicants request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and these remarks and arguments.

Embodiments of the claims 1 – 5 disclose a television set. The television set comprises of a receiver and a prompt mode function. The receiver receives a television broadcast including a prompt. The prompt mode function of the receiver sets a presentation of the prompt to one of an enabled state and a disabled state during the broadcast. The prompt indicates the presence of an information address in the broadcast. The information address indicates how additional information about the broadcast can be obtained. The transmission of the information address occurs only after the presentation of the prompt is set to the enabled state.

Claim rejections -35 USC § 102

The examiner has rejected claims 1 – 5 under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. (6,771,317). Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Macrae et al. (20030005463). Claims 1 – 3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. (6,177,931).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitation that transmission of the information address occurs after the presentation of the prompt is set to an enabled state. Support for this amendment is found at least in column 12, lines 58 – 68 and Fig. 13, and Fig. 14 of Applicants specification. Such a limitation is not found in any of the

cited references. Therefore, since the limitation is missing from all the cited references, a rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Further, it is noted that claims 2 – 5 add further limitations to the allowable claim (claim 1); therefore the rejection of claims 2 – 5 is improper and should be withdrawn. As such the claims should proceed to allowance.

The examiner has rejected claims 1 – 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. (6,771,317). Referring to Ellis, there is a description that in each of the FLIP, BROWSE and MENU modes appears a lower case “i” which indicates additional information comprising a textual description and/or other related information connected to certain programs for the user to view. Ellis, col. 18, lines 45 – 55. However, Ellis does not teach about the presentation of the prompt set by a prompt mode function, wherein the prompt mode function sets the prompt to an enabled state or a disabled state. Further, Ellis does not disclose transmission of an information address only after the presentation of the prompt is set to the enabled state. Therefore, since the limitation is missing from Ellis, a rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Further, it is noted that claims 2 – 5 add further limitations to the allowable claim (claim 1); therefore the rejection of claims 2 – 5 is improper and should be withdrawn. As such the claims should proceed to allowance.

The examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Macrae et al. (20030005463). Referring to Macrae, there is a description of a graphical icon on a portion of a displayed video signal indicating to the user that additional information concerning the television program is available through the internet. Macrae further describes of the graphical icon placed in an unobtrusive portion of the television signal. Macrae, page 4, paragraph [0046]. However, Macrae does not teach

about the presentation of the prompt set by a prompt mode function, wherein the prompt mode function sets the prompt to an enabled state or a disabled state. Further, Macrae does not disclose transmission of an information address only after the presentation of the prompt is set to the enabled state. Therefore, since the limitation is missing from Macrae, a rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. As such claim 1 should proceed to allowance.

The examiner has rejected claim 1 – 3, 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. (6,177,931). Referring to Alexander, there is a description of an icon which indicates additional information about a program. Alexander describes about an instructional icon on a navigation bar to provide additional information. Alexander, col. 4 lines 62 to col. 5 line3. However, Alexander does not teach about the presentation of the prompt set by a prompt mode function, wherein the prompt mode function sets the prompt to an enabled state or a disabled state. Further, Alexander does not disclose transmission of the information address only after the presentation of the prompt is set to the enabled state. Therefore, since the limitation is missing from Alexander, the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Further, it is noted that claim 2 adds limitation to the allowable claim (claim 1); therefore, the rejection of claim 2 is improper and should be withdrawn. As such the claims should proceed to allowance.

Regarding claims 3, 5, the examiner states that “Alexander further discloses a location table output..., wherein the location table output also display the prompt (icon “i”) to allow a user obtaining the additional information through activating the prompt “i” which then connects to a web site address, wherein the location table output is determined by a local channel identifier....”. Applicants disagree with the examiners

interpretation about a location table output. Applicants disclose the location table output that is configured to receive geographical information from a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver. Support for this is found at col. 14, lines 45 – 47. However, Alexander's discloses a grid that is configured to display a list of programs along with their respective channel location in a table form for a specific time. Alexander, Figs. 3 – 10. Therefore the rejection of claims 3, 5, is improper and should be withdrawn. As such the claims should proceed to allowance.

Claim rejections -35 USC § 103

The examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander et al. (6,177,931). Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiners opinion and traverse the rejections. The examiner states that “ Alexander discloses the location table output is broadcasted by a satellite..., wherein the satellite broadcast is a global positioning system input which is known to those skilled in the art in order to get information anywhere in the world”. The examiners reliance on Alexander's location table output is misplaced. Alexander discloses a location table output which displays a list of programs along with their respective channel location in a table form. Alexander, figs 3 – 10. However, Applicants disclose the location table output that is configured to receive geographical information from a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver. Support for this is found at col. 14, lines 45 – 47.

First, and most clearly the examiners belief regarding Alexander's location table output is incorrect. Secondly, the examiner failed to provide any motivation for such location table output in Alexander. As such there in no motivation provided that a person

with ordinary skill in the art would modify Alexander's grid to get Applicants location table output. Further, according to column 28 line 14 of Alexander's description, the EPG requests the viewer to provide with the information regarding the satellite services to which the viewer has subscribed. Alexander discloses this satellite to receive a TV broadcast and not location information. Therefore rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn. As such claim 4 should proceed to allowance.

In view of the aforesaid, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 is in condition for allowance. Because the independent claims are in condition for allowance, it logically follows that the dependent claims are also in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully Submitted
Eaton, Eric Thomas

Date: December 26, 2006

BY: /Douglas S. Rupert/
Douglas S. Rupert
Registration No. 44,434
Phone (847) 523-4782
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350